



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXV.

AUGUST, 1900.

AMERICA'S DUTY IN CHINA.

BY JOHN BARRETT, FORMERLY UNITED STATES MINISTER TO SIAM.

CHRISTENDOM is staggered by the crisis in China. But America's duty is definite; her path is plain.

The world's policy in Cathay is the commanding question of the hour. It overshadows national controversies regarding imperialism and the coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one. It is the paramount issue in an international campaign to conserve the world-quickenings forces of Christianity, Civilization and Commerce.

Therefore, every American, even in this sultry mid-summer month, whether leisurely resting in cool resorts or laboriously earning his daily bread in city or country, should study well the part America must play on this new stage of international action.

In Asia, America and the world are face to face with an unparalleled and unprecedented situation; but America's policy will be the allied world's policy, if America acts on the strength of her unique position and does not shirk the impending task.

We see the United States unexpectedly summoned to meet in China graver moral responsibilities than it has ever confronted in the Philippines. Likewise, it is challenged by greater material

opportunities than it will ever discover in all the other undeveloped portions of the world.

In this hour of peril and through trials that shall follow, we must remember that we are a Christian as well as a commercial nation. We are a moral as well as a material force. We are a civilizing as well as an exploiting agency. This is a supreme test in the competition of nations, in a struggle where the principle of the survival of the fittest has its stern and cruel application. Possibly now, as China and the allied nations of the world are in deadly struggle in North China, whether with riotous hordes or government forces, our Anglo-Saxon race, our Anglo-Saxon religions, our Anglo-Saxon systems of society and government are at stake. We cannot, therefore, quail before our responsibility. There is no question of imperialism or expansion involved other than that of the salvation and extension of our race and our institutions.

I do not mean that the United States shall go out of its way to assume responsibilities, to arrogate to itself leadership, to take ostentatiously upon its shoulders the burdens of the world. Rather shall it simply perform its plain duty, as an officer in battle, who, standing in a central, commanding strategic position, holds the fate of his regiment in his hands and determines victory by combining discretion with heroism.

I. AMERICA'S POSITION AND POLICY.

Through all the confusion of the present and the mystery of the future, there stand out these dominant considerations:

First, America is the logical arbiter of China's future; the fate of the Empire depends upon the favor of the Republic;

Second, if there is a Yellow Peril threatening the White World, America, more than any other Power, can lead the way to rendering it colorless and innocuous; because,

Third, America is the only nation present in China to-day, with force and with prominent interests, rights, and commerce, which has the unqualified confidence and trust of the European nations, Japan and China alike, or is not the object of long-standing jealousy and distrust; and,

Fourth, an International Congress or Conference, in which America for the three reasons just given should occupy a prominent and possibly the leading part, will, in the nature of events, be assembled in the near future, to consider what shall be the

attitude and policy of the nations of the world, not only in coping with the great problems of the re-establishment of order, the rehabilitation of the Government, the award of punishment and indemnities, but in determining the future status of China's government and territory and their relation to the outer world.

With this responsibility and position, what shall America's policy include? There should be no equivocation as to the principles involved. Expressed briefly, the main planks in our Chinese platform might be stated as follows:

1. The United States desires and should take no port, province or part of China, either as a sphere of temporary influence or as an area of actual sovereignty.

2. The United States should oppose, with all its moral, political and diplomatic influence, any partition of China among the foreign Powers, or any delimitation of acknowledged spheres of influence.

3. The United States should insist upon the permanent maintenance of the trade principle of the Open Door; as outlined in the present Chinese treaties, throughout all China, by all the Powers endeavoring to exercise influence within her limits.

4. The United States, provided the dissolution of the Empire is inevitable, despite our best efforts of diplomacy and moral suasion, should insist upon the guarantee, by formal convention, of the Open Door principle in all the various areas of foreign sovereignty in China, and will carefully guard against excuses for discriminating duties, national rebates or subsidies, and special freight charges—for the consuming powers of an increasing population of four hundred millions of people and the material development of four millions of square miles are involved.

5. The United States, acting with charity and equity, and in no spirit of vengeance, should employ all its moral and material influence in prescribing just punishment and indemnity for loss of life and property sustained at the hands of fanatical and insurrectionary mobs; in adjusting the true moral responsibility of the overwhelmed government; in establishing permanent order and honest progressive administration of government throughout the Empire; in safeguarding, both for the present and the future, the lives, rights and holdings of missionaries, merchants and other foreign residents; and, finally, in so preparing the way for peace, order and prosperity, to be followed by liberty, justice and free-

dom under the guiding direction of Christian civilization, that we shall win the lasting gratitude of the countless blameless Chinese and make them forever our disciples in moral and material progress.

With the future of China there are concerned four great European factors: Russia, England, Germany and France; two Asiatic, China herself, and Japan; one American, the United States. In such a combination jealousies, distrust and bickerings may clog the way to a satisfactory solution of the great problem. For instance, which one of the first four would the other three select and follow? They could unite on none, and yet all are most friendly to the United States and always willing to listen to its representations. Again, what non-Asiatic Power would China and Japan alike trust? Only America. This was confirmed by their attitude toward America in their late war. Toward what country has China the most friendly feeling? Without doubt, America. For a long time she has recognized us as the only country desiring none of her territory, and wishing to maintain only and always the most amicable relations with her. Even the Chinese Exclusion Act has cut little figure in Chinese-American relations, for its operation has been felt only by a small portion of Chinese in the southern part of the Empire. My theory is simply that the United States is the one nation, from its remarkable strength of position, that can exercise the vigorous moral influence and leadership in the coming negotiations of the Powers, which will assure the settlement of the present crisis, first, with strict justice and honor to all nations concerned, and, second, with no selfish scramble for territory that will lead to the violent break-up of the Empire and the ultimate shutting of the Open Door.

To some, in describing America's prominence and in emphasizing the importance of the crisis, my words may seem those of enthusiasm or exaggeration. Some years' diplomatic experience in Asia may make me speak feelingly, but not rashly and incorrectly. Conditions, not imagination, inspire my conclusions.

II. THE OPEN DOOR AND PARTITION.

Expressed plainly, America has everything to lose and nothing to gain by a divided China; equally true is it that America has everything to gain and nothing to lose by an undivided China.

With China actually partitioned among the foreign Powers.

or nominally divided into spheres of influence, we can still have the Open Door. It will exist, however, with the ever-present possibility that actual sovereignty would eventually close the door through discriminations or rebates in duties or freights. Possession, moreover, is nine-tenths of the law, and agreements made in troublous times of Chinese sovereignty may not be held always sacred in times of European sovereignty, especially if new international complications shall develop.

America's chief market in China is now found in Manchuria and in the provinces inclosing the Gulf of Pechili, the scene of the present revolution. Throughout this area we have so far had the Open Door and been able to sell our manufactured cotton goods in successful competition with the rest of the world. We have developed our sales of cotton textiles from \$1,600,000 to over \$10,000,000 in the last ten years. If the Open Door is maintained, we shall build up this trade tenfold or more. On the other hand, if Russia, Germany or some other Power assume sovereignty, there is the imminent possibility of the cotton manufacturers of those countries demanding preferential railway or steamer rates, which will annul the force of any agreements. They may even demand of their respective governments that these agreements shall be cancelled. This would not be done without protest and difficulty, but when the first international complication arose, or when, for instance, retaliation in trade relations might be necessary, there would be a change of tariffs and duties that might shut out the American product.

Here the Southern States have vast concern. The new industrial prosperity of Dixie has its opportunity largely in supplying manufactured cotton goods to China. The closing of that field of consumption permanently would bring widespread depression to the South.)

This is only one illustration. The same story might be true of a French sphere in Kwang-tung, Kwang-se and Yun-nan; of a Japanese sphere in Fuh-keen; of an Italian sphere in Che-keang; of a German sphere in Shan-tung, although we must give these countries credit for assurances that they will follow the policy of the Open Door.

Great Britain has gone so strongly on record as favoring the Open Door, and has so faithfully proved the honesty of her intentions by her policy in her dependencies, that we need have little

worry about the future of the great Yangtsze Valley. Unfortunately, however, our interests and opportunities there are not so large as in the sections which might go to countries that have not proved their good faith through both preachings and practice during an extensive period of years.

While describing the possible dangers of a partition of China, let us be fair and give due credit to other countries. Let us not forget that in the Russian territory of Eastern Siberia and in Manchuria, where Russia now is apparently evolving a sphere of influence, American trade is rapidly developing, and that there is a vast field there for legitimate exploitation. If the conventions which Russia, Germany and France have signed with China, in regard to certain ports and parts of the Empire, include terms which would seem to be in violation of the spirit and letter of our treaties with China in the matter of the Open Door and equal privileges and rights, there has not yet been any test case of importance to prove that there is discrimination against us.

Great Britain has been the pioneer in the Open Door movement, but only two years ago she was appealing in vain to us for co-operation to prevent alienation of territory and to protect trade rights. Lord Charles Beresford forewarned us of present events, but excited no interest beyond a cordial reception. With the hope of stirring up political passion, certain demagogues denounce any possible sympathy of the United States with England in the latter's Chinese policy. This is done in face of the fact that, wherever English authority is paramount in Asia, there are order, prosperity and a fair chance for everybody and all nations—unless nature, in the form of famine, brings unrest. In Hong Kong, England has demonstrated how successfully she can lead the Chinese to their and her advantage.

Russia has worked mighty changes in Eastern Siberia. She generally has extended to America a welcoming hand in commerce. She announces Dalny, formerly Talienwan, as a free port and gateway to Manchuria. Germany proclaims that there will be no discrimination at Ching-taou, or Kiao-chow, against the merchants and ships of other nations.

The masterly diplomacy of Secretary Hay has, furthermore, secured recent assurances, from all the Governments interested in China, that American rights will be permanently safeguarded. If the Powers are sincere, we can be hopeful of the future, but

the treachery of international complications often renders meaningless diplomatic notes exchanged in a friendly hour.

If, by the inevitable force of world-events, China is to be despoiled of her territory, then let this same diplomacy of John Hay, or his successor, obtain from every nation securing sovereignty over a part of the Empire a lasting agreement, in unqualified terms, that America shall have in perpetuity the same rights of trade therein as are granted not only to the most favored nation, but to the sovereign power itself. Let this agreement not be confined to a diplomatic note, nor to an exchange of intentions with happy felicitation, but let it be a binding convention, formally signed and sealed.

In this connection, there occurs this vital consideration: In all reasonable probability there is not a Power that will refuse to be a party to such a treaty, if America firmly presses the point to consummation. There is also the cardinal thought in this whole question, that stands out like a beacon light: No power will insist to the limit of force upon the division of China, if America protests with all its moral resources against division.

III. THE GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE.

In this world-crisis, where races, religions, institutions are at stake, America's policy in China should be supported by Democrats and Republicans alike.

The partisan plea that President McKinley's unremitting efforts to protect American life and property in China may lead us into war with some European Power is not well founded. There is little probability of our being embroiled, either in a single-handed or in an international war, if we follow our definite duty in the plain path before us, and do not shrink from the unavoidable moral responsibilities which are imposed upon us as a Christian nation, having vast interests at stake. We can afford to do our allotted work in China because our moral strength is admitted, and our moral and material interests demand it.

We shall need, as we are now exercising, broad diplomacy in adjusting to a nicety the Chinese situation. We are fortunate in the past achievements of the State Department; we, therefore, have confidence for the future. President McKinley, Secretary Hay, and their subordinates, have already won the confidence of the European Powers and Japan, and the lasting gratitude of

China, in the policies they have promulgated previous to the present revolution.

Since the first cry of distress and warning of disaster came from Peking, the Government has left no stone unturned to rescue the lives of our Minister and his family at Peking, and of missionaries and merchants in the same disturbed locality. Immediately following Mr. Conger's request for marines, they were dispatched with all haste to the capital. Then followed, as the danger of the situation developed, an unremitting endeavor to send reinforcements. All that were available were forwarded. The unfortunate contingencies of a typhoon in Manila Bay, the necessity of not weakening materially the force in the Philippines, the difficulties of approach to Tientsin and Peking, the distance of Taku from Manila and from the United States, cannot be set down at the door of the Administration. A careful survey of everything done since notification came to Washington from the only authoritative source, the legation at Peking, will show that the President cannot be held responsible for the reported disaster to foreigners at the capital.

We cannot blame the American residents of Shanghai, in their earnest desire for the protection of American lives and commerce, for using urgent terms in appealing to the Government to do everything in its power in this difficult situation, but if the Government has met that responsibility to the best of its ability, its efforts should be justly appreciated.

It must be remembered, moreover, while public sentiment is so deeply stirred, that every other Government, if there is blame, is as deeply involved in it as the United States. If Russia, with her force at Port Arthur, Great Britain at Wei-hai-wei, Germany at Ching-taou, and Japan with her unlimited resources near at hand, could not rescue their envoys, why should Americans suggest that the President could have saved the Minister of the United States? It must not be forgotten, also, that the foreign representatives themselves at Peking were, in a measure, responsible for the inability of their respective countries to rescue them. Had they made appeals for force earlier, these would have been honored. No request of Minister Conger, in this respect, has ever been pigeon-holed or disregarded by the State Department.

May I not here suggest that our possession of the Philippines—which the anti-imperialists so strenuously oppose as criminal

aggression, but which others, who spent long years in Asia and were in the Philippines during the development of the present situation, honestly believe are ours simply as a result of our courageously meeting unavoidable moral responsibilities, complicated by an insurrection inspired by ambitious leaders and the enemies of the United States—has enabled us to cope with the present Chinese situation in time, manner and force which would not have been possible without our presence there. Despite the failure of the allied troops to reach Peking in time, our record has been to our credit, pride and honor in the competition with other nations. Under other conditions, we would have been entirely dependent upon other Powers, and possibly treated by them with patronizing kindness or negative indifference. Our soldiers have been in the front lines of attack and defense, and we have done our part as a first-class Power in the presence of overwhelming responsibilities.

But if there is any doubt in the minds of some men about our policy in China, let there be no misunderstanding about territorial aggrandizement. Once and for all, we want no part of China; we will take no part of China; we demand only the Open Door and protection for the lives of our representatives, missionaries and merchants, under conditions of reform and progressive government.

Even visions of coaling stations and a northern rendezvous for our Philippine naval squadron must not tempt us at this hour into an equivocal position on this vital consideration. If we should weaken one jot or tittle, our influence in Asia would lose its healthy force. The confidence of Europe, the trust of Japan and the respect of China would then be forfeited. Nothing could save the integrity of the Empire, and the hinges of the Open Door would be oiled for the closing.

IV. A MCKINLEY DOCTRINE IN ASIA.

We have a Monroe Doctrine in America; shall we not have a McKinley Doctrine in Asia? This is said in all seriousness and without a suggestion of political bias. No matter how much some men oppose the President's Philippine policy, either in honesty of conviction or in zeal of party fealty, the permanent protection of life and property, the well-being of missionaries and merchants, the vast moral and material interests of the United

States, and a high degree of patriotism should inspire them to support his Chinese policy—not only the policy of the moment, but that which he has already initiated in recent negotiations with the Powers.

Shall not the McKinley Doctrine in China mean that America shall stand with all its strength for the permanent maintenance of the Open Door in China—an open door through which the diplomat and the traveller, the missionary and the merchant, the engineer and the educator, shall pass and re-pass forever in safety?

As corollary to the main proposition, shall not the McKinley Doctrine in China mean that America shall stand with all its legitimate moral influence to prevent any Power whatsoever, monarchical or republican, acquiring sovereignty over any extended part of the present unpartitioned area? And, possibly, in the growing power and name of our good land, this use of moral influence, to the full extent of its lengthening tether, may in a peaceable way accomplish as much in Asia, as the use of moral *and* armed force, which the Monroe Doctrine involves, can accomplish in America.

Then, with the Monroe Doctrine shutting out Europe from governmental control of the Americas, and with the McKinley Doctrine opening up the vast markets and material opportunities of Asia to the United States, it may be indeed difficult to determine which doctrine will confer the most direct and lasting benefits on the largest number.

Commerce is the life-blood of nations. The commerce of Asia may yet be needed to give us the strength to conserve the governments and commerce of the Americas. The McKinley Doctrine in the Pacific and China may provide the sinews of war to defend the Monroe Doctrine in the Americas.

V. CHINESE RESPONSIBILITY.

In judging the responsibility of the Chinese people and government for these uprisings and massacres, we must be stern but **not** vengeful. We must find all of those who are guilty and **punish** them as they deserve. While the world is not in a mood to forgive the Chinese government for its compromising course with the so-called Boxers, it must remember that this has been a riotous movement, which has developed force and apparent organization as a snowball grows into an avalanche, and over-

whelmed both the government that temporized with it and the foreign forces that strove to check it. If the authorities had crushed it in its inception we would have heard little or nothing of it. Unfortunately for themselves and for the outer world, they let it go on, as sometimes we have even known American officials to do with mobs, until it was beyond control.

There is no question that recent seizures of territory by foreign Powers, particularly those in the Shan-tung and Liao-tung Peninsulas, have had a baneful effect. Moreover, anti-foreign officials in the interior, taking advantage of this foreign invasion and of their personal hatred of the missionaries, have even fostered the publishing of misleading placards about missionaries and other foreigners. They are largely responsible for the internal excitement. The widespread famine prevailing in North China has greatly aided the development of anti-foreign feeling. Lack of rain and failure of crops have been blamed upon the foreigners by Boxer agitators. The Boxers themselves are simply an organized anti-foreign body of men under a new name, who have excited the masses.

In dealing with them the Central Government made the cardinal error of compromising with them, instead of putting them down at first. Even such capable foreign representatives as Minister Wu at Washington, Minister Conger at Peking, and Consul-General Goodnow at Shanghai, did not seem to understand this mob movement and realize its strength until, like a flood started by a cloudburst, it was breaking through all barriers. What was the effect on the masses at a critical moment of bringing marines to Peking, of the capture of the Taku forts, of the reported burning of the Tsung-li-Yamen by German soldiers, of the alleged failure of the envoys to leave Peking when ordered, cannot yet be accurately told, but it would now appear to have added fuel to the flame.

In this connection, it is well to note the strong words of the Americans expressed at their mass meeting at Shanghai on July 18th. Their appeal included this significant conclusion: "The present outrages are the result of the weak and vacillating policy of the Powers in the past."

If the Powers have hesitated in the past, they will be staggered with the work now before them. The reorganization of the Chinese government on lines of modern progress will be a mighty

undertaking, of which the outside world has little conception. China is not lacking in able men; but conservatism, custom and tradition have figured so prominently in all administrations through centuries that radical changes and new methods will not be welcomed, and will be opposed by officials and masses alike.

VI. MISSIONARY AND MATERIAL INTERESTS.

Of the missionaries in China I have much more to say in praise than in censure. I do not sympathize with the superficial criticism often found in the treaty ports and expressed by passing travellers against them. They are doing far more good than harm. For years it was my privilege to study carefully their work in Siam, where over one hundred were under my jurisdiction; and in frequent visits to China I noted the methods and results of their labors there.

The sum and substance of the anti-missionary sentiment among the ignorant Chinese is this: the corrupt local officials are opposed to the missionaries, because the Chinese who are taught or converted by them know what is just and right, and demand it. Perhaps the matter goes up to the Viceroy for complaint through the Taotai or Consul and back again. This makes trouble for the official, and causes him in revenge to wink at anti-foreign agitation and the publication of malicious posters. When we withdraw our missionaries from Asia, then let us withdraw our ministers and merchants. The missionary interests of the world in China are too vast, too widely ramified and too deeply rooted for any foreign government to suggest that they shall be withdrawn from China. Then above all is the supreme consideration that the forces of Christianity which have been struggling for centuries in Asia cannot consider now for a moment the possibility of retreat and defeat.

Many may honestly differ with me in my opinion of missionary work, but I cling to the faith of our fathers, confirmed by long experience and observation in Asiatic city and jungle.

What has the world materially at stake in China? What has America at stake there? These questions are frequently proposed by those who, in the rush of other matters, have not heretofore studied China. In former contributions to the REVIEW I have endeavored to point them out. Though summarized briefly, some of those which are important and suggestive of wide possi-

bilities are here noted. China, with 400,000,000 people, in 4,000,000 square miles, has only 400 miles of railway, but needs in the near future 40,000 miles. Her foreign trade is \$333,000,000 per annum, an increase of one hundred per cent. in ten years. America's share, including Hong Kong, is \$43,000,000, or one-eighth, in the mere infancy of its development. China's *per capita* trade, with greater potential resources than Japan, is less than one dollar, against Japan's six dollars. Apply the latter's ratio to China's population and we have the magnificent possibility of \$2,400,000,000. There are mighty waterways, rivers and canals to be improved, dredged and bridged; coal, iron, gold, copper, tin and silver mines to be developed; numberless cities to be provided with waterworks, sewerage systems, electric lights and street railways; telegraphs and telephones to be extended; roads to be built, and countless increasing millions supplied with food, clothes and other growing wants of peoples coming into contact with the outer world.

In the face of these immeasurable opportunities, the improvement of which will bring vast benefits to capital and labor in America, who is willing to suggest that we shall retreat and leave China to the control of European nations?

In conclusion, I may be pardoned for quoting the final words of an address which I had the honor to deliver before the Shanghai General Chamber of Commerce on the 12th of January, 1899: "I beg of you, in judging America's policy in the Far East, to remember that these closing days of the nineteenth century are times that try men's souls, when all nations are unsettled in policy and uncertain as to what the future will bring forth. There is confusion in the minds of the people and doubt in the thoughts of statesmen. The United States has its share of trial and tribulation. But there will soon be an end to it all, when the sunshine of peace and certainty must break through the dark clouds of politics. Let us hope that this day may soon come and bring with it such decision as will promote the comity, prosperity and well-being of all nations, American, European and Asiatic."

JOHN BARRETT.